1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE LIMITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
10	ARKEMA INC., a Pennsylvania Corporation,	
11	and GENERAL METALS OF TACOMA, INC.,	
12	a Washington Corporation,	
13	Plaintiffs,	NO. CV05-5087
14	v.	
15	<b>v.</b>	
16	ASARCO, Inc., a New Jersey Corporation;	ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT AND
17	BALFOUR GUTHRIE & CO., LTD., a Delaware Corporation; SYGEN	DISMISSING AND BARRING CLAIMS AGAINST JCI JONES CHEMICALS, INC.
18	INTERNATIONAL PLC, an English Corporation; ECHO LUMBER CO., an Oregon	Adamoi jerjones ellemicals, me.
19	Corporation; GOODWIN JOHNSON (1960) LTD., a Canadian Corporation; JOHNSON- BYERS, INC., a Washington Corporation; JCI	
20		
21	JONES CHEMICALS, INC., a/k/a JONES CHEMICAL COMPANY, INC., a New York	
22	Corporation; MILGARD MANUFACTURING	
23	INC., a Washington Corporation; DONALD E. OLINE, a Washington resident; PETROLEUM	
24	RECLAIMING SERVICE, INC., a Washington	
25	Corporation; PORTAC, INC., a Washington Corporation; and WEYERHAEUSER	
26	COMPANY, a Washington Corporation;	
27	Defendants.	
28		

1
1

The Court, being fully advised in the premises and for good cause shown, hereby grants

Plaintiffs' Motion and makes the following findings and order:

FINDINGS

- 1. Arkema, Inc. and General Metals of Tacoma, Inc. ("Plaintiffs") filed a complaint in this case on February 1, 2005, asserting claims for contribution against defendant JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc. (the "Settling Defendant") and other defendants under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f) and the Washington Model Toxics Control Act ("MTCA"), RCW 70.105D.080, and contractual indemnity. Plaintiffs' claims are based upon response costs they allegedly incurred in responding to the release of hazardous substances to an area known as the Head of the Hylebos which is a portion of the Hylebos Waterway Problem Area located within the Commencement Bay Nearshore/Tideflats "Superfund Site, a designated National Priorities List site in Tacoma, Washington (the "Site").
- 2. Certain defendants in this case have asserted cross-claims for contribution and/or indemnity against other defendants, including the Settling Defendant, under CERCLA, MTCA and other state and federal laws.
- 3. The Plaintiffs have entered into a good faith settlement agreement dated September 29, 2005, with the Settling Defendant (the "Settlement"). The Settlement releases the Settling Defendant from claims asserted by the Plaintiffs. The Settlement is contingent upon this Court's approval and issuance of an order dismissing and barring claims against the Settling Defendant.
- 4. Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendant negotiated at arms-length and considered the strengths and risks of their respective cases, evidentiary and legal issues as known at this time, and the expenses of litigation.
- 5. The Settlement and the application of the principles of section 6 of the Uniform Comparative Fault Act, 12 U.L.A. 126-53 (1996), with respect to the Settlement's effect on Order Approving Settlement and Dismissing and Barring Claims 2 #1117010 v1

## Case 3:05-cv-05087-RBL Document 135 Filed 11/10/05 Page 3 of 3

1			
2	nonsettling defendants in this case are fair and consistent with the purposes of CERCLA and the		
3	strong federal policy favoring settlements.		
4	ORDER		
5			
6	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
7 8	1. The Settlement is approved and all claims by Plaintiffs against the Settling Defendant		
9	are hereby DISMISSED, WITH PREJUDICE.		
10	2. All claims for contribution against the Settling Defendant relating to the Site under		
11	CERCLA, MTCA or any other applicable federal or state laws are hereby BARRED and		
12 13	DISMISSED, WITH PREJUDICE, including those claims asserted by the remaining, nonsettling		
14	defendants.		
15	3. The principles of Section 6 of the Uniform Comparative Fault Act, 12 U.L.A. 147		
16	(1996) shall govern the effect of the Settlement on Plaintiffs' claims against nonsettling defendants		
17	and that Plaintiffs' recovery, if any, against the nonsettling parties shall be reduced by the Settling		
18 19	Defendant's equitable and proportionate share of liability for response actions at the Site, as		
20	amitable desired associated associated as said		
21	Done this 9 <sup>th</sup> day of November, 2005.		
22			
23	BY THE COURT:		
24			
25			
26	Konald 15. Leightun		
27	RONALD B. LEIGHTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
28	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		